

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action mailed August 23, 2007, claims 1 – 20 were rejected. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the below-provided remarks.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1 – 7 and 9 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muthu (U.S. Pat. No. 6,507,159) in view of Zhang et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,461,397, hereinafter Zhang).

Claim 1

Claim 1 particularly points out that the drive signals are adjusted on a per-light source assembly basis and a per-light source basis in response to feedback signals from a plurality of feedback units. Claim 1 recites in full:

“A control system for a Light Emitting Diode (LED) based light system, comprising:

a plurality of light source assemblies, each light source assembly comprising a light source of a first color and a light source of a second color, the first and second colors being different;

a plurality of feedback units for generating feedback signals representative of luminance and chrominance characteristics; and

a controller in signal communication with said plurality of feedback units configured to provide drive signals to the light source assemblies during respective non-overlapping intervals such that a light source of the first color in a first light source assembly and a light source of the first color in a second light source assembly are driven at non-overlapping intervals and such that a light source of the second color in the first light source assembly and a light source of the second color in the second light source assembly are driven at non-overlapping intervals and to adjust said drive signals on a per-light source assembly and a per-light source basis in response to feedback signals from said plurality of feedback units.” (emphasis added)

The Office action cites Muthu as teaching a light source assembly, feedback units, and a controller but admits that Muthu “fails to teach a plurality of light sources” and that Muthu fails to teach driving the light sources at “non-overlapping intervals” as recited in claim 1. Zhang is cited for teaching the limitations which Muthu allegedly fails to teach.

Applicants assert that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established from Muthu in view of Zhang because the combination of prior art references fails to teach a controller that is configured “to adjust said drive signals on

a per-light source assembly and a per-light source basis in response to feedback signals from said plurality of feedback units” as recited in claim 1.

Muthu teaches a single light source assembly (10) that includes red, green, and blue LEDs. Muthu also teaches adjusting the LEDs of the single light source assembly on a per-color basis in response to feedback signals. However, because Muthu teaches only a single light source assembly, Muthu has no reason to teach or suggest adjusting the drive signals of multiple different light source assemblies on a per-light source assembly basis in response to feedback signals from a plurality of feedback units as recited in claim 1.

Zhang teaches a display device with multiple different “subsections of independently controllable color light pulse generation elements.” (elements 32 in Fig. 1 of Zhang) Zhang also teaches that the subsections are driven at non-overlapping intervals as illustrated in Fig. 2. However, Zhang teaches nothing about adjusting the drive signals of the light sources on a per-subsection basis in response to feedback signals from a plurality of feedback units as recited in claim 1. That is, while Zhang does teach driving the subsections on a per-subsection basis, nowhere does Zhang teach a feedback operation associated with the light subsections (32). In particular, Zhang does not teach adjusting the drive signals on a per-subsection basis in response to feedback signals from a plurality of feedback units as recited in claim 1.

Given that Muthu does not teach multiple light source assemblies and that Zhang does not teach adjusting drive signals on a per-light source assembly basis in response to feedback signals from a plurality of feedback units, Applicants assert that the combination of Muthu and Zhang teaches a light system that has multiple light source assemblies driven at non-overlapping intervals. However, neither Muthu nor Zhang teach or suggest that the drive signals should be adjusted on a per-light source assembly basis in response to feedback signals from a plurality of feedback units. As stated above, Muthu teaches adjusting the LEDs of a single light source assembly in response to feedback signals, however, Muthu makes not mention of adjusting drive signals of multiple different light source assemblies on a per-light source assembly basis.

Further, the Office action does not address how the combination of Muthu and Zhang teaches adjusting the drive signals on a per-subsection basis in response to feedback signals from a plurality of feedback units as recited in claim 1. The Office

action states that it would have been obvious to drive the light sources at non-overlapping intervals as taught by Zhang “in order to better control the white point and/or luminance properties of each assembly.” Applicants assert that the driving of light sources at non-overlapping intervals does not teach how the white point and/or luminance properties of each light source assembly are controlled and further does not teach adjusting the drive signals on a per-light source assembly basis in response to feedback signals from multiple feedback units. As taught by Zhang, the non-overlapping drive signals are generated “to allow color light pulses to be generated in synchronization with the scanning operation of the front end unit.” (Zhang, abstract) Applicants assert that synchronization of color light pulses with a scanning operation has nothing to do with adjusting the drive signals on a per-light source assembly basis in response to feedback signals from a plurality of feedback units as recited in claim 1.

In sum, given that Muthu does not teach multiple light source assemblies and that Zhang does not teach adjusting drive signals on a per-light source assembly basis in response to feedback signals from a plurality of feedback units, Applicants assert that the combination of prior art references fails to teach a controller that is configured “to adjust said drive signals on a per-light source assembly and a per-light source basis in response to feedback signals from said plurality of feedback units” as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that for the foregoing reasons a *prima facie* case of obvious has not been established.

Independent Claims 10 and 16

Independent claims 10 and 16 include similar limitations to claim 1. Although the language of claims 10 and 16 differs from the language of claim 1 and the scope of claims 10 and 16 should be interpreted independently of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that the remarks provided above in regard to claim 1 apply also to claims 10 and 16.

Dependent Claims 2 – 9, 11 – 15, and 17 – 20

Claims 2 – 9 depend from claim 1, claims 11 – 15 depend from claim 10, and claims 17 – 20 depend from claim 16. Applicants assert that these claims are allowable at least based on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Date: October 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Mark A. Wilson

Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham

PMB: 348

2530 Berryessa Road

San Jose, CA 95132

Phone: (925) 249-1300

Fax: (925) 249-0111